Tells the Facts and Names the Names

\$2.50

CounterPunch

September 1-15, 2005 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* VOL. 12, NO. 15

Killing People is ... Inappropriate

By Alexander Cockburn

Each time some loudmouth calls for the CIA to murder an inconvenient foreign leader, the tut-tuts of the State Department get more and more casual. When Pat Robertson called a few weeks ago for a CIA hit on Venezuela's Chavez, the best the State Department could manage was a softly murmured "inappropriate". Maybe, just like torture, it's finally being acknowledged that assassination has long been standard U.S. policy.

The CIA tried several times to kill Iraq's General Kassem. The first such attempt, on October 7, 1959, was botched badly, and one of the assassins, Saddam Hussein, was spirited out by the Egyptian Mukhabarat to an Agency apartment in Cairo. There was a second Agency effort in 1960-1961 with a poisoned handkerchief. Finally, they had Kassem shot to death in the coup of February 8-9, 1963 that brought Saddam to the fore. Kassem was a very impressive man, as Roger Morris recently reminded me: an Arabized Kurd from Kut with a Shia mother and a Sunni father, a practicing Sunni who knelt at the sickbed of the Grand Ayatollah of his mother's faith, in symbolism every Iraqi understood. Kassem even embraced the Kurds (whom he'd fought as a soldier) until the Brits bought them back to rebellion, as usual. As Morris remarks, "Kassem was just what poor sick GW needs in Baghdad now, of course."

Except, of course, Kassem was a reformer from the left side of the ledger.

A Trotskyite Tourist

I was prowling the other day through a box of old Communist Party literature

(**Killing** *continued on page 6)*

Questions for the Terror Warriors

Surgical Incisions

By ANDREW WIMMER

The American ideal, then, of sexuality appears to be rooted in the American ideal of masculinity. This ideal has created cowboys and Indians, good guys and bad guys, punks and studs, tough guys and softies, butch and faggot, black and white. It is an ideal so paralytically infantile that it is virtually forbidden – as an unpatriotic act – that the American boy evolve into the complexity of manhood.

James Baldwin, "Freaks and the American Ideal of Manhood"

In the mid-1980s I lived for a while in Nicaragua, in the old city of León. Just down the street was a prison that the various Somozas had put to good use, sitting unapologetically alongside the Spanish cathedral and imposing colonial churches. The prison had been notorious as a place of torture. After the triumph of the Sandinista revolution, the doors to the high-walled complex were removed from their hinges, and anyone was free to wonder the rooms. Your fingers could trace – if you would allow them – the words and fragments of grief that had been chiseled into the stone walls by former inmates. Though sunlight now streamed in, the place was black and cold; those passing by on foot instinctively gave it a wide berth.

Nicaragua was the country where I began to grow up. Having missed the Vietnam draft by one year, I was still clinging to certain pious beliefs, even if I wasn't buying the whole pie of American exceptionalism. The grim reality of human torture and the raw exercise of power, funded and directed by U.S. overlords, was borne home to me. There were the more notorious public cases that made the press at home – the assassination of Oscar Romero, the slaying of the six Jesuit priests and their two housekeepers, and the abduction, rape and murder of four American churchwomen. But there were the thousands and thousands of others, men and women, who were "disappeared" during those bloody years. I have a vivid mental picture of the morning I spent with the *Madres de los Desaparecidos* in a small house down a side street in San Salvador. They displayed before me on a plain wooden table the many large plastic binders in which they had gathered and preserved the stories and pictures of their husbands, sons, brothers. Gazing out from the binders' well-thumbed plastic sleeves were the faces of the untimely dead. Bodies turned up in mass graves. Bodies dumped on the side of the road, perhaps sometimes a severed cock stuffed in the mouth, as if the stupidly juvenile messenger wasn't sure his point would be understood.

I thought the task we had over the last twenty or thirty years of exposing human torture to the light of day was a horrible burden. A constant challenge to find the right words, right time, the chink in the psychic fortifications that keep all of that stuff at bay here, in what James Baldwin once called our "dangerously adolescent nation."

Our presidents and secretaries of state, generals and CIA directors, Democrats and Republicans, have long practice in the

(**Surgical Incisions** *continued on page 3)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Interview with Sheik Hadi al-Khalassi

Voices of the Iraqi Resistance

By LAITH al-SAUD

The following is the second interview in the CounterPunch series *Voices of the Resistance*. By giving voice to actual Iraqis who are tied to the political events in Iraq, we hope to counter the crude caricatures that have thus far misled the world in this conflict. By allowing the opposition in Iraq to speak for itself, a fuller and more accurate picture of the occupation emerges. The following discussion is with Sheik Hadi al-Khalassi of the Iraq National Foundation Congress. The INFC is perhaps the largest political opposition group in Iraq.

Laith al-Saud: What is the INFC and what are its goals and mission?

Sheik Hadi al-Khalassi: The Iraq National Foundation Congress is an umbrella organization that provides a political framework and unity for those groups opposed to the occupation of Iraq. It was formed shortly after the invasion and occupation. Contrary to the reports by the western media, the opposition in Iraq is composed of Sunni and Shi'a Arabs, Kurds, and Christians. Likewise, the INFC mirrors this political reality and is made up of all components of Iraqi society; all varieties of nationalist movements, political parties, religious communities and Islamic views are represented within the INFC. The INFC is the largest umbrella organization in Iraq, one of our main members is Harith al-Dhari of the Association of Muslim Scholars, and we also have members from al-Sadr's movement, not to mention the Christian Democratic movement and other nationalist movements. This reality counters the myth that the resistance is limited to one "community". Opposition to the occupation is popular and legitimate.

The INFC is one of the largest political opposition organizations in Iraq, why has it been largely ignored by the western media?

The western media, almost in their entirety, support the occupation. So, since we oppose the occupation, the western media have actively kept us out of their reporting of political events.

Yet this problem has not only been limited to the western media; when certain Arabic news sources covered our second conference, they did not broadcast it due to pressure placed upon them by the occupying powers. The occupying forces have been successful in applying pressure on independent media outlets in Iraq through restricting their future access to news sites and other means.

What is the INFC's view of the armed resistance?

We have stated clearly in our press releases that resistance is a right for the Iraqi nation, and we distinguish between the right to resist, in all its political and martial components, and terrorism. We unambiguously condemn terrorism and define terrorism as anything that targets innocent civilians. We define resistance as all movements, armed or political, that target occupying forces, and we assert it as a right. We condemn terrorism as criminal activity.

What is the INFC's view of the current government?

We see the current government as having a functional role – as providing basic services such as running the health ministry and the like. We do not, however, view the current Iraqi government as having any legitimacy, as it was not brought about by an authentic electoral process. The current government, therefore, is in no position to sign long-term agreements, change the social and economic character of Iraq or anything of the sort on behalf of Iraq. This is true especially of federalism, which we see as an attempt to break Iraq up, to weaken the country, and further American influence.

Why does the INFC consider the elections as illegitimate?

The INFC is not opposed to an election process, certainly not. In fact, the INFC was not necessarily opposed to the idea of having an election while the American forces were still present; we provided a list of conditions for our own participation in the elections yet none was met.

We requested that occupation troops withdraw from the cities so as not to intimidate voters, that all American incursions into Falluja and Najaf cease, and that innocent prisoners be released. Regarding this last request it must be remembered that up to 90 per cent of all prisoners being held by the occupying forces in Iraq are being held without charge and indefinitely (the international Red Cross has confirmed this).

Lastly, we asked for more international observers, in particular from Arab and Muslim countries, to ensure the independence of the process. None of these very reasonable demands was met, so we boycotted the elections as a protest to the process and because of its serving of occupation interests only.

The political process in Iraq has thus

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business
Becky Grant

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Voices** *continued from page 2)*
far served an imperial strategy on the part of the invaders. We have not been able to assess any contribution to the greater good and have seen every choice made by the occupying forces in Iraq as destructive and destabilizing. This destructive force has extended to the drafting of the constitution due to be completed shortly. Federalism, one of the main themes of constitutional discussions, is clearly – very clearly – an effort to divide Iraq. This cannot be seen as good by any Iraqi.

What is the level of operating ability that the INFC has in Iraq? For example has there been any restraint placed on the INFC by the current government in Iraq?.

The political powers currently in Iraq have definitely placed pressures on the INFC, ranging from moderate pressures to outright security threats. We have had some of our members arrested, and an assassination attempt was made on Sheik Jawad al-Khalassi, the Secretary General of the INFC.

What demands does the INFC have and what steps has it taken to secure those demands?

Our demands are clear: Iraq must be a fully independent and sovereign nation that is not obligated to any agreements made while under occupation and is not subject to the presence of military bases. We seek to rebuild our country after it has been unjustly ravaged by an aggressive war and create a new political process built on the foundations of independence and *true* freedom.

In this regard we have exerted a great amount of energy in preserving the social unity of the country as we have seen the occupying forces work hard in dividing it. The INFC has focused on maintaining harmony between the various communities of Iraq through communication and representation in our unified political group. We repeat, we have seen consistent attempts by the occupying forces to create conflict between Iraq's diverse communities, and we have politically resisted all attempts to do so.

Whatever crises the world now sees in Iraq cannot be ended until these things that we have discussed are realized. The occupation must be ended and all traces of it removed. We are certain that Iraq will

(**Surgical Incisions** *continued from page 1)*
art of dissembling.

Over time, though, voices and actions coalesce. Then a catalyst, Roy Bourgeois and his companions head up a tree at Fort Benning in the dead of night in 1983 with a tape recorder and loud speaker and cause frenzy among the Latin American generals sojourning there at the School of the Americas. Since then, thousands have gathered at the gates each November to carry on that work – those who know that the United States and torture have long gone hand in glove. U.S. generals and CIA operatives shared the fruits of their research with dictators and thugs around the globe.

I was taking an early morning walk recently with Jean, a good friend who directs a small agency that offers psychological treatment to the victims of war trauma and torture – men and women who have made their way here to St. Louis from wars in Africa, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Iraq. "I get so exhausted," she confided. "I was working with a man this week who was captured and suffered years of bitter torture. As is not unusual, I triggered a flashback in the middle of the session, and he lurched toward me and reached for my neck with both of his hands. I very slowly moved my right hand up to my throat in a gentle blocking motion. He broke down. 'See! How will I ever be able to hold a job? I'm afraid that I will kill someone. Look at my eyes. There is no life in them.'"

Officials in Baghdad wrote an e-mail to interrogators in the field on Aug. 14, 2003, stating that the "gloves are coming off" and asking them to develop "wish lists" of tactics they would like to use.

Yes, I thought our task had been difficult before, but now, what a strange and perilous time we find ourselves in. Torture carried out in our names is now discussed in casual conversation, as party banter. The photographic evidence is available to anyone with a TV – or a computer and mild curiosity. And there is the promise of more to come. I thought we had a hard struggle before, but now the challenge to penetrate the wall is altogether more daunting – and the stakes.

But then along comes Cindy Sheehan. And like Roy Bourgeois heading up the tree, and the mothers with their books of witness we find that the wall is only a few words thin. Words of truth, spoken with conviction. She has a question for the president. And it becomes one that makes the guy with the bomber jacket, swagger, and much commented-upon codpiece take to the hills. And like Cindy Sheehan in the ditch, the Salvadoran mothers were faithful in their refusal to keep silent. And their insistent questions made the big guys with the swaggers and the *cojones* crazy.

I think of Jean and her clients as each new revelation appears in print. What are we to make of it all? In early August the Guardian broke this story of Benyam Mohammed:

Benyam Mohammed travelled from London to Afghanistan in July 2001, but after September 11 he fled to Pakistan. He was arrested at Karachi airport on April 10, 2002, and describes being flown by a US government plane to a prison in Morocco. He was also held in the Dark Prison (a detention centre in Kabul with windowless cells and American staff), Bagram air base in Afghanistan, and Guantánamo Bay. These are extracts from his diary.

"They cut off my clothes with some kind of doctor's scalpel. I was naked. I tried to put on a brave face. But maybe I was going to be raped. Maybe they'd electrocute me. Maybe castrate me.

"They took the scalpel to my right chest. It was only a small cut. Maybe an inch. At first I just screamed ... I was just shocked, I wasn't expecting ... Then they cut my left chest. This time I didn't want to scream because I knew it was coming.

"One of them took my penis in his hand and began to make cuts. He did it once, and they stood still for maybe a minute, watching my reaction. I was in agony. They must have done this 20 to 30 times, in maybe two hours. There was blood all over. "I told you I was going to teach you who's the man," [one] eventually said.

"They cut all over my private parts. One of them said it would be better just to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cut it off, as I would only breed terrorists.

"I was in Morocco for 18 months. Once they began this, they would do it to me about once a month. One time I asked a guard: 'What's the point of this? I've got nothing I can say to them. I've told them everything I possibly could.'

"'As far as I know, it's just to degrade you. So when you leave here, you'll have these scars and you'll never forget. So you'll always fear doing anything but what the US wants'."

"I suffered the razor treatment about once a month for the remaining time I was in Morocco, even after I'd agreed to confess to whatever they wanted to hear. It became like a routine. They'd come in, tie me up, spend maybe an hour doing it. They never spoke to me. Then they'd tip some kind of liquid on me – the burning was like grasping a hot coal. The cutting, that was one kind of pain. The burning, that was another.

"In all the 18 months I was there, I never went outside. I never saw the sun, not even once. I never saw any human being except the guards and my tormentors, unless you count the pictures they showed me."

So, like the mothers in Salvador, like Roy Bourgeois, like Cindy Sheehan, I now have questions to ask. The first few are for George Bush. Should you have the opportunity to pose them before I do, feel free. (The infantile press corps, busy proving their macho *bona fides* on the mountain bike trails of the Crawford compound, are giddily consumed with reporting Bush's heart rate after 17 miles of strenuous riding.)

"Mr. Bush, you have assured us that the United States does not condone torture and that your administration is committed to the rule of law. Yet at the same time your lawyers have argued that we must not tie your hands when it comes to using whatever means you see fit when interrogating those you've detained in the 'war on terror'. This has caused not a little confusion, so I want to ask you this. Would you personally condone – or perhaps even personally carry out – an interrogation that included making small incisions in a man's left and right breasts with a surgical scalpel and then repeatedly slicing his penis and testicles with the same instrument, until his cock and balls were a nothing but a bloody pulp in your hand?"

Earlier this summer appearing at the World Tribunal on Iraq, journalist Dahr Jamail offered his testimony "about ongoing violations of international law being committed by the occupiers of Iraq on a daily basis in regards to rampant torture, the neglect and impeding of the health care sector, and the ongoing failure to allow Iraqis to reconstruct their infrastructure. To discuss torture, there are so many stories I could use here, but I'll use two examples which are indicative of scores of others I documented while in Iraq." Here is the first.

Ali Shalal Abbas was living in the Al-Amiriyah district of Baghdad. So many of his neighbors were detained that friends urged him to go to the nearby US base to try to get answers.

He was forced to strip naked shortly after arriving, and remained that way for most of his stay in the prison. "My hands were enlarged because there was no blood because they cuffed them so tight. My head was covered with the sack, and they fastened my right hand to a pole with handcuffs. They made me stand on my toes to clip me to it."

I very slowly moved my right hand up to my throat in a gentle blocking motion. He broke down. 'See! How will I ever be able to hold a job? I'm afraid that I will kill someone. Look at my eyes. There is no life in them.'

Abbas said soldiers doused him in cold water while holding him under a fan, and oftentimes, "They put on a loudspeaker, put the speakers on my ears and said, "Shut Up, Fuck Fuck Fuck!"

Treatment included holding a loaded gun to his head to make him not cry out in pain as his hand-ties were tightened.

He was not provided water and food for extended periods of time. Sleep deprivation via the aforementioned method was the norm.

A female guard told the male detainees that the penis of a dog was longer than theirs, and for Abbas and several other detainees she made them strip naked, tied their hands tightly behind their backs, threw them on the ground, and made them say, "I am a donkey" over and over while they were forced to lick the ground.

Will the press dare put a question to Donald Rumsfeld that has some specificity? That names names and lays out the details? That asks about donkeys? If not, here is my question for him.

"Mr. Rumsfeld, when you reviewed the guidelines to be followed by United States military investigators you allowed quite a wide range of so-called 'stress techniques' and even asked why standing was limited to four hours when you yourself stood for eight hours a day at your desk. Given that you take particular personal pride in being able to stand for long periods without complaint, I would like to know whether you would be willing – in the course of an interrogation – to test a man's stamina by stripping him naked, fastening cuffs around his wrists, and hanging him from a bar with his toes just barely touching the floor. Perhaps leaving him in that stressful standing position for days, without food?"

And as if to make my complicity in all of this much more real to me, I live in a state represented by a Republican senator who cannot imagine that "our guys and gals" would ever engage in torture. Consider, then, this recent account from the *Washington Post*, August 3 of this year:

Iraqi Maj. Gen. Abed Hamed Mowhoush was being stubborn with his American captors, and a series of intense beatings and creative interrogation tactics were not enough to break his will. On the morning of Nov. 26, 2003, a U.S. Army interrogator and a military guard grabbed a green sleeping bag, stuffed Mowhoush inside, wrapped him in an electrical cord, laid him on the floor and began to go to work. Again.

Hours after Mowhoush's death in U.S. custody on Nov. 26, 2003, military officials issued a news release stating that the prisoner had died of natural causes after complaining of feeling sick. Army psychological operations officers quickly distributed leaflets designed to convince locals that the general had cooperated and outed key insurgents.

Although Mowhoush's death certificate lists his cause of death as "asphyxia due to smothering and chest compression," the Dec. 2, 2003, autopsy, quoted in clas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sified documents and released with redactions, showed that Mowhoush had "contusions and abrasions with pattern impressions" over much of his body, and six fractured ribs. Investigators believed a "long straight-edge instrument" was used on Mowhoush, as well as an "object like the end of an M-16" rifle.

The U.S. military initially told reporters that Mowhoush had been captured during a raid. In reality, he had walked into the Forward Operating Base "Tiger" in Qaim on Nov. 10, 2003, hoping to speak with U.S. commanders to secure the release of his sons, who had been arrested in raids 11 days earlier.

In the months before Mowhoush's detention, military intelligence officials across Iraq had been discussing interrogation tactics, expressing a desire to ramp things up and expand their allowed techniques to include more severe methods, such as beatings that did not leave permanent damage, and exploiting detainees' fear of dogs and snakes, according to documents released by the Army.

Officials in Baghdad wrote an e-mail to interrogators in the field on Aug. 14, 2003, stating that the "gloves are coming off" and asking them to develop "wish lists" of tactics they would like to use.

An interrogator with the 66th Military Intelligence Company, who was assigned to work on Mowhoush, wrote back with suggestions in August, including the use of "close confinement quarters," sleep deprivation and using the fear of dogs, adding: "I firmly agree that the gloves need to come off."

And, so, my question for Senator Jim Talent. "You said last spring, in response to a reporter's question, that you didn't see any need for the Senate to conduct additional investigations into charges of torture perpetrated by United States troops. Your exact words were, 'If our guys want to poke somebody in the chest to get the name of a bomb maker so they can save the lives of Americans, I'm for it.' My question, then, is this. Let's say you were personally carrying out an interrogation. Could you see yourself beginning by poking the man you're questioning in the chest with the butt of your M-16, shattering a few of his ribs? And then perhaps stuffing him in a sleeping bag and working on him further with your fists and a length of rubber hose if the poking proved ineffective?"

And just recently, *The Guardian* ran this story about the behavior of British troops in the south of Iraq:

Brothers Marhab and As'ad Zaaj-al-Saghir claim troops stole their family car and cash. Marhab said his brother was tied up after they were arrested and then they were both taken to an internment camp where they were abused.

Marhab said: "They lowered me down ... while I was tied up, threw me on the floor and hit me with a stick. You couldn't draw breath afterwards and I lost consciousness. I thought they would throw water over us but he got his penis out and urinated on my head."

"If I'd had a weapon I'd have killed myself," he added.

And the war continues apace. Uniformed generals appear before Congressional panels explaining why the release of further pictures from Abu Ghraib will only serve the disinformation campaign of the enemy. Secretary of State Rice looked forward earlier this week to the formation of new "rapid response" teams under the direction of Karen Hughes that will "work to deal with misinformation and misinterpretation," getting the word out to the world of our true intentions. Ms. Rice said the administration discovered during the war in Afghanistan that it had to rebut "all kinds of lies about what we were doing." Meanwhile, the 500 videotaped hours of activity by that other "emergency response force", the so-called ERFing of prisoners at Guantánamo, remain under lock and key more than a year after their existence was first disclosed.

All of this has me thinking about the Democrats and leads me to ask one more question:

"Mr. Kerry, Mrs Clinton, Mr. Biden, you have been critical of the administration and the way in which it is waging our wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. You have said that it is important to 'get the war right'. You often express this in terms of providing better body armor or sending more troops. Would it also include the stepped-up use of cluster bombs and napalm? Or more effective urban sieges? Or pissing on the heads of our Iraqi brothers and sisters?"

White man, hear me! A man is a man, a woman is a woman, a child is a child. To deny these facts is to open the doors on a chaos deeper and deadlier, and, within the space of a man's lifetime, more timeless, more eternal, than the medieval vision of Hell.

James Baldwin, "The White Man's Guilt"

Bush, Rumsfeld, Talent, Biden, Kerry, Clinton, hear us! We will not torture another human being. And we will not stand by as you do it in our name. We will not be dragged into the pit of Hell. We will find the tree to climb. We will find the ditch to camp in. Together we will break through the wall of silence. It's only a few words thin.

Withdraw United States troops from Iraq now. Arrest the war criminals. CP

Andrew Wimmer is a member of the Center for Theology and Social Analysis (CTSA) in St. Louis and teaches at St. Louis University. He invites you to join a public conversation at http://www.ctsastl.org/ and http://www.stoptorturenow.org/

Members of CTSA are involved in solidarity work with Palestine, care for refugees and victims of war trauma newly arrived in St. Louis, direct action against torture, and neighborhood revitalization. This piece is dedicated in gratitude to Mark Chmiel, August 22, 2005, who counsels us to read more Whitman: "cheer up slaves and horrify despots."

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year $40 Two yrs $70
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $12.50 for Canadian and $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want Counter-Punch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Killing** *continued from page 1)*

belonging to the late George Criley, sent to me by his niece, Honey Williams. Among predictable pamphlets on Lysenko, Dimitrov, and other notables of the 1940s I came across *Fighting Words*, published in 1949, selections from 25 years of the *Daily Worker*.

There were many very fine pieces of reporting, from Abner Berry on a cotton plantation in Alabama to William Allan in Michigan about 288 black workers "sold" to a canning company for $35 each, shipped up from Georgia to farm camps, separated from the pigs by straw bales.

On October 16, 1947, there was a proud bulletin, titled "Socko!" about the achievement of the *Worker's* horse-racing tipster , Al. On his second day on the job Al picked "a phenomenal total of six winners in the seven races at Jamaica yesterday". Readers putting $10 on each of Al's picks would have cleared $116. In his years on the British *Daily Worker* some time earlier my father and the rest of the staff often survived on the excellent predictions of their tipster.

Further into *Fighting Words* my eye was caught by the title, "A Trotskyite Slumming Trip", published on November 26, 1947. It was by Samuel Sillen, and took the form of a robust attack on Edmund Wilson. Here it is.

"The editors of *The New Yorker*, with grotesque humor, financed a sort of intellectual slumming trip by Edmund Wilson through postwar Europe. He left his Baedeker home, but not his Trotskyism. His report, published in his new book, *Europe Without Baedeker,* unutterably dull, is worth nothing except as a symptom of the moral decay of capitalist apologists.

"Wilson felt most at home in a convent cell at the Hospital of the Blue Nuns in Rome, where he discussed with George Santayana his quaint 'weakness for Mussolini'. Wilson's militant, unabashed hatred of people naturally accompanies a hatred of the democratic upsurge in post-Hitler Europe. The author laments his departed friends Trotsky and Tukhachevsky, waxes homesick for Alexander Barmine, consoles himself that De Gaulle's big brain, Andre Malraux, is one of 'the most valuable forces still alive on this devastated continent'.

'Then he scoots back to America with a dazzling proposal. He wants us to set up a Board of Breeding. We should not be so 'foolish' as to allow Nazi failures to 'discourage us with eugenics'. Wilson offers this bright vista: 'If we can produce, from some cousin of the jackal and the wolf, the dachshund and the Great Dane, the Pekinese and the poodle, what should we not be able to do with man?'

"Fortified by this dog-theory of history, Wilson finds a new key to what is 'wrong' with Socialist ideas. It is that Karl Marx was a Jew, 'and, being a Jew, from a family that had included many rabbis, he identified the situation of the factory worker with the situation of the Jew'. Marx, says Wilson, mistakenly assumed that workers released from capitalism would behave in terms of 'Jewish tradition'. He did not foresee that 'what happens, when you let down the bars, is that a lot of gross and ignorant people who have been condemned to mean destinies before, go rushing for all they are worth after things that they can eat, drink, sleep on, ride on, preside at and amuse themselves with'.

"Thus, in one stroke, the Trotskyite tourist for *The New Yorker* combines the Nazi view of Marxism as a peculiarly 'Jewish' philosophy, the Bourbons' contempt for the masses as wild animals, and the hoary capitalist warning that we must not 'let down the bars' to the working class.

"This leads up to the inevitability-of-war thesis. Wilson goes a step further than your run-of-the-mill warmonger. Not only can't we get along with the Soviet leaders, but Americans 'will never be able to co-operate as peoples' with the Russians. It is 'ridiculous', says Wilson, to think of the Russian people today as 'civilized'." Wilson, borrowing a cue from De Gaulle's Malraux, evidently aspires to be a braintruster of the fascist forces. It is not only moral and intellectual rottenness that we find in his book, but the savagery of desperation."

One might have thought that Boards of Breeding would not been on Wilson's shopping list, only two years after the defeat of Nazism, but eugenic selection – ardently backed by American liberals the end of the nineteenth century – was big in the late 1940s.

In 1949, Professor Garrett Hardin was writing anguished nonsense about America's declining IQ in his biology textbook and the need for proper cleansing of the national gene pool. Malthus is never far away, nor the sterilizer's toolkit, intellectual and physical. CP

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
Phone 1-800-840-3683 for our new t-shirts and for advance orders of CounterPunch's new book The Case Against Israel *by Michael Neumann.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED